



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

make so capital an error in quotation in order to advance another error in regard to Homer. Wilamowitz has recently given the glory to Zenodotus of being the creator of the great Alexandrian recension. Aristarch durfte nicht mehr *recensui* sagen, sondern nur *recognovi* und erkannte das durch seine Zeichen, die auf Zenodot verwiesen, auch an. Sitz. der kgl. preuss. Akad. 1910, 376.

This sentence has led Roemer to a thorough investigation of the relative importance of Zenodotus, Aristophanes, and Aristarchus, and he reaches this conclusion: Zenodotus and Aristophanes were not competent to produce a text according to strictly scientific methods; being slaves of prejudice and false opinion, depending solely on superficial observation, they did not and could not produce an edition of Homer of any high value. Their failures helped Aristarchus to discover the true method, so that by infinite labor and most careful observations he founded the genuine science of philology.

He says in regard to Wilamowitz, p. 171, Da hatte nun Aristarch einen sehr verbrecherischen Gedanken und meinte: Ehe man kritisiert und konjiziert, sollte man vorher etwas studiert haben und beging die unglaubliche Torheit, sich darauf hin seinen Homer anzusehen. Freilich durch diesen Irrwahn, dass man studieren müsse, hat er sich den Weg gänzlich verbaut zur "schöpferischen Kritik". Die neueste Offenbarung von Wilamowitz ist also—bei einem andern würde ich vielleicht sagen Wind, bei Wilamowitz sage ich—nur Phantasie, jedenfalls eher alles andere, als Wissenschaft.

I cannot read the scholarly work of Professor Roemer without feeling that he has assigned the Alexandrians to their true positions. It is only by the accurate observation of all the facts according to the methods followed by Dr. Belzner and Professor Roemer that we can hope for the final solution of the Homeric problem.

JOHN A. SCOTT.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY.

Thucydides, Book IV. Edited by A. W. SPRATT. Cambridge, At the University Press: New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1912.

Mr. Spratt's edition of the Fourth Book of Thucydides follows the same lines as his Third and Sixth Books, which have found and deserved wide acceptance. A special feature is the diligence with which he has noted the phenomena of moods and tenses. This, I presume, is what he calls in his preface 'milk for babes', and I, for one, have no reason to quarrel with his preference for condensed milk. There is no neater statement of the

φθάνω-rule than one finds on c. 4, 6: φθάνω exacts from its participle a rigid synchronism, which is the sum and substance of A. J. P. XII 76. The emphasis thus laid by Mr. Spratt on Thukydides' exactness in the use of moods and tenses goes far to redeem the historian from the charge of imperfect mastery of the language, and this exactness is matched, as might easily be shown, by exactness in other lines.

The critical apparatus is very full, such an apparatus as would have been welcome many years ago when I took up the Fourth Book in the Greek Seminary, moved thereto by Rutherford's edition (cf. A. J. P. XV 115), which is hardly ever mentioned now except as one of the aberrations of a scholar, noted for his aberrancy. When Rutherford's Fourth Book appeared, a well-known French reviewer remarked that he had out-Cobeted Cobet, and Mr. Marchant, who when he edited the Second Book was overborne by his chief's hectoring ways—Hector is a favourite Scottish name (cf. A. J. P. XVIII 244)—has since learned, as he confessed in his edition of the Third Book, that 'a long acquaintance with MSS has caused <him> to withdraw entirely from the opinion of those who detect incessant interpolation and wholesale corruption in the MSS <of Thukydides>.' True, Mr. Murray, in his History of Greek Literature, has still a good word to say for Rutherford, but as Mr. Grundy has put the case (l. c., p. 48): 'The essay was peculiarly unfortunate; the more so as the textual corruption was ascribed in the main to copyists of the second and later centuries A. D., and the first century (Oxyrrhynchus) text agrees closely with the received text of the present day'. To the same purport Sir John Sandys in his History of Classical Scholarship I² 285, and another critic, Sir William Ramsay, wrote some months ago with cruel frankness (Expositor, June, 1911): The main value of <Rutherford's edition> simply is to prove that its initial principle is false.

Mr. Spratt's Introduction to the Fourth Book is a puzzle. He gives only the prelude to the Peloponnesian War, whereas one could expect at least a summary of the first six years of the War; and in that prelude he contents himself with a foot-note in which he remarks that 'modern criticism has suggested a fourth cause of war, the commercial rivalry of Corinth and Athens'—a brief mention which will be a distinct disappointment to Messrs. Cornford and Grundy and their surviving forerunners (A. J. P. XXVIII 356; XXXII 482). Mr. Spratt does not commit himself, but I imagine that he would sympathize with Mr. Zimmern, who, in the Preface to his Greek Commonwealth, says: 'It has long been clear to historians that economic circumstances had a good deal to do with the Peloponnesian War; yet we have no right to pass from this to an explanation of the whole struggle in modern economic terms'. It has been my own fortune to live through a great war, αἰσθανόμενος τῇ ἡλικίᾳ, and I know how easy it would be

to represent our Civil War as the result of the invention of the cotton gin—it has been so represented—as the result of the machinations of an overseas Corinth—it has been so represented—as a question of tariffs, as the conflict between two systems of labor, the tyranny of the boss of a mill and the tyranny of the master of a plantation, white ‘mudsill’ against black ‘mudsill’. My own little contribution to the literature of the war (Atlantic Monthly, Jan. 1892, Sept. 1897) has been lightly put aside in certain quarters as a ‘poetical view’, but poetry is more philosophical than history, and I explained my Civil War out of Thukydides.

B. L. G.

Yiddish dictionary, containing all of the Hebrew and Chaldaic elements of the Yiddish language, illustrated with proverbs and idiomatic expressions, compiled by Dr. C. D. SPIVAK, and SOL. BLOOMGARDEN (Yehoash). New York, 1911, pp. xxxi + 340.

The dictionary of the Hebrew elements in the Yiddish language compiled by Dr. Spivak and the well-known Yiddish lyric poet Bloomgarden (generally known by his nom de plume *Yehoash*) is a fine piece of scholarly work, and is deserving of much praise. It fills a long-felt want. It is, therefore, advisable to call attention to several of its characteristic features:

(1) Completeness. It is the first complete dictionary of the Hebrew elements in Yiddish which has thus far been published. The several older dictionaries are rare and entirely inadequate.¹ The omissions in the Spivak and Bloomgarden dictionary are few and unimportant. Of these the following may be mentioned: *megabber* (sein) “to bury”, *menadder* (sein) “to vow a contribution”, *megaššem* (sein) “to materialize, embody”, *menaššeq* (sein) “to kiss” (vulgar), *beṭeba’* “by nature, naturally” *asmakhta* (Talm.) “proof, support” (rare in Yiddish), *otho maqom* (Talm.) “pudenda” (rare in Yiddish), *meba’er* “commentator”, and a few others.²

(2) The explanations are brief but lucid and illuminating. Owing to this feature the compilers have been able to compress much material in little space.

¹ Similarly the Judeo-German-English dictionary of Alexander Harkavy (New York, 1898; 6th edition, 1910) is inadequate as far as the Hebrew elements in Yiddish are concerned.

² A few words appear in the wrong place: *meba’er hametz* (sein) should be treated on p. 140^a, after *mebalbel* (sein), instead of on p. 139^a, and *matteketh* “metal” should be given after *mithkawwen* instead of after *methiqdth*.